

Date: Mon, 15 Aug 94 04:30:07 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #374
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 15 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 374

Today's Topics:

 CW VIEWS

 In-Reply-To: CW ...IS history!
 Let's kick this idea around... (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 13 Aug 1994 00:06:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!
charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!
abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW VIEWS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 2E479881@ornl.gov, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:
>In article <3261c0\$qhvh@chnews.intel.com> Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:
>ue to
>>be free to use CW and so will I. "We" will simply be free of the present
>>use of governmental force or threat of force to cram CW down "our" throats.
>
>No one is cramming CW down "your" throats. There are gigahertz of frequencies
>to access without demonstrating competency in Morse code. If "we" are so
>noble to want to stop the government from being an advocacy for any mode,
>let's campaign against the current NPRM to assign 132 KHz of HF spectrum to
>automatic packet data stations. The failure to do the latter brings into
>serious question the former.

As a quick reality check, Clay is apparently confused. The government is relaxing the restrictions against automated digital modes, allowing it to be used in some band segments on HF. Do not be confused; the FCC is not restricting the use of 132KHz of HF to automated packet *only*; the FCC is allowing this mode to be used along with other authorized modes, such as Morse code.

It does not bring into question the motives of those opposed to government sanctions against/for particular modes. The government is removing a sanction against a mode, not incorporating a sanction against a mode.

Before Clay responds with "But no one will be able to operate CW in those band segments with all those digital noise makers going", realize that those band segments are already mostly occupied by digital packet operation.

Anyway, if Morse code is so superior, why should a little digital noise be a problem? :-)

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?" *

Date: Thu, 11 Aug 1994 18:48:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!swiss.ans.net!

malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: In-Reply-To: CW ...IS history!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

wx3k@w2air.tcpet.UScg.MIL (John Zantek) writes:

>3. For my entire career, I have carried a green military active duty
>ID card that clearly says ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES on it, as
>required by the Geneva Conventions.

But as you pointed out the CG is not part of the DOD. Though it may perform a military function, its main purpose is law enforcement and providing for the safe passage of shipping thru American waters and of course defense of those waters (and shores).

The coast guard has done fantastic things, including the lions share of the defense of the east coast against the U-Boats in WWII. But as you pointed out it is part of the DOT with a different mission than the DOD.

{snip}

>7. I was the guilty party who stopped the CW training.

Boy are YOU in for it.

>Sorry for the diatribe and bandwidth, but I wished to state the record.

PLEASE do NOT apologize. Getting it right from the 'horses mouth' so to speak does us all good. THANK YOU.

```
> John Zantek WX3K   Internet: jzantek@tcpet.uscg.mil <-----,
>   [44.4.40.104]    Packet: WX3K@WX3K.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM   |
>   Data 707 765 7016  Amprnet: wx3k@w2air.ampr.org          |
>                                                           |
>                                                           |
>                               Even the _Internet_ says I'm in the military!
```

Sorry, all that says is that the coast guard choose that over the .gov those being the two more likely designations. And are you saying that the internet assigned that to your system? Gee where is the interent? Who owns it? I would like to thank him/her/them. :-)

Dan

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: Thu, 11 Aug 1994 18:22:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!swiss.ans.net!
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Let's kick this idea around...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

suggs@tcville.es.hac.com (Brian Suggs) writes:

>...long tirade deleted

>

>I don't know about the rest of you but I read the original message not as

>"What do you think about breaking the rules this way...?" but rather as

>"What do you think about changing the rules so that you could do this...?"

>

>While I agree that a CB or part 15 walkie talkies would probably fit

>your purpose, it got me thinking: What if you rigged an HT so it was

>controlled by a remote link from another radio? You could then be the

>(remote) control operator and the non-amateur would be covered under the

>third party rules. The only problem I see is that the other end of the

>contact is yourself, so there aren't really three parties. You would be
>the control operator at both ends of the conversation. Is it legal to have
>a QSO with yourself on amateur radio? :-)

Is it 'third party traffic' for ME to use an autopatch on the N8PKV
repeater? It would be MY station talking to MY station and another party?
Interesting.

I am sure that the FCC would consider it a remotely operated station thus
under control of a control operator (provided you meet the requirements
for remote control). Thus the station would be operated in accordance with
the rules. But would the traffic be legal? Interesting!

Dan

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: 14 Aug 1994 11:19:43 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!
vela.acs.oakland.edu!prvalko@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Let's kick this idea around...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

: Again, which purpose of amateur radio does this rule change fullfill?

I'm not exactly sure what the FCC would have called it, but I'd *think*
it would save the same purpose as the elimination of logging
requirements, and perhaps the ruling that permitted novices to use
VFO's.

Probably just to make things a little easier? Perhaps because it is a
sensible request given the state-of-the-art? Perhaps because it's
happening now, albeit illegally, and not causing any trouble? Honest
Dan, I really don't know why the FCC passes some rule changes and tosses
others out. I do believe this rule change would be beneficial and not
create any more problems than we already have, and perhaps even reduce
some.

Regards,

paul wb8zjl

Date: Mon, 15 Aug 1994 02:13:09 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Let's kick this idea around...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Andy Domonkos (domonkos@access.digex.net) wrote:

: The work-around to this situation is the GMRS license, full repeater
: operations, talk to the family, whatever. The above is why many hams
: have mod'd their HT's. They THINK no one is listening, but they
: forget to check where they're transmitting. Heck, I guess the FCC is
: listening too since a handful of hams were busted here in Maryland
: for working out-band. Would've been cheaper getting a GMRS setup.

: Andy

There's a huge problem with relying on the GMRS for most of this
stuff. If you get a license, it only covers you, your family (well,
those who actually live with you), and your actual employees. Since I
have no employees, if I got a GMRS license it would only cover me and
my wife. My brother-in-law, and everyone else I know, would not be
licensed, and each one, household by household, have to fork over \$35
and wait 8-10 weeks before I could hand anyone that stupid RS GMRS HT
that costs 40% more than the red dot business band edition (there's an
idea! At least I'd only have to get one license, and whatever we had
to say would sound perfectly normal on 151.625). Oh, yes, add the
time to wait for the form to come from Maryland. And the form is so
complex that if you don't show them how to fill it out you can double
the wait time for the re-do. It may actually be easier - even faster!
- to get them amateur licenses!

I can sympathize with the Commissioners who envisioned a catch-all
Citizen's Band, for the personal use of ordinary people who needed a
radio service for communications that didn't fit any established
category of service, but unfortunately it's impossible to believe that
CB is a viable way to meet most of those needs today. And there must
be a cheaper, less resource-intensive way to meet such simple needs
than than high-tariff cellphones (which, paradoxically enough, work
better than GMRS when it comes to keeping in touch with my wife). But
today nothing really fits most of these needs very well.

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com

Date: Mon, 15 Aug 1994 01:31:38 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Aug10.095731.1@aspen.uml.edu>, <32b5vi\$n3f@hacgate2.hac.com>,
<081194182202Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

: Is it 'third party traffic' for ME to use an autopatch on the N8PKV
: repeater? It would be MY station talking to MY station and another party?
: Interesting.

Is it third party traffic if you use a remotely controlled simplex
patch? Yup.

: I am sure that the FCC would consider it a remotely operated station thus
: under control of a control operator (provided you meet the requirements
: for remote control). Thus the station would be operated in accordance with
: the rules. But would the traffic be legal? Interesting!

I'm inclined to think that if each transmitter had a control operator
who insured compliance with the rules, whether a third party talked
into a hand microphone, or an HT mic, or a telephone mic, would be
irrelevant. The trick is making sure you really have control.

Good thread.

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com

Date: Thu, 11 Aug 1994 18:32:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.113.2E4674CC@ornl.gov>, <1994Aug10.170118.16672@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<wyn.118.2E4A313C@ornl.gov>, ñ
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

>conclude that there is little humanly possible that can be done to alter their
>course. Therefore, when two or more machines are able to successfully
>communicate between points A and B in the HF spectrum has very little to do
>with "when the human licensee is not available".

Oh, thats why guys get up early to work their favorite band because "it's
open THEN". Gee I thought you just said it was dependent on timing not on
when the operator is available. Which is it. Does it depend on nature's
cycle or when the human licensee is available? Or is that YOU get it both
ways depending on what you argue.

>As I have pointed out before, in discussing the unattended automatic HF machine
>operation plan with some of its architects, (maybe they were not part of the
>"we" group) they fully intend to create clear channel conditions attempting to
>drive off the current users of these frequencies with QRM, although they use
>code words such as competition, survival of the fittest, etc. to describe the
>activity. This will obviously be attempted when the human users are there, not
>when they are not there. In turn, what will happen is, to borrow a prophesy
>from K1ZZ when discussing the effects of other noise generators on the HF
>spectrum, the human users will QRO. The effect will then be to raise the
>average noise level of the infected parts of the band -- so much for QRP and
>RF pollution limits.

But HF is the BEST mode to get thru no matter what. Or are you saying
that there are better modes that would get thru when Morse encoded CW can
not. Again, you argue it whatever way suits you at the time. You want your
cake and eat it too.

Dan

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: Thu, 11 Aug 1994 18:45:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Aug10.213624.7262@mixcom.mixcom.com>,

<32c4e1\$aa7@oak.oakland.edu>, <1994Aug11.134725.3647@mixcom.mixcom.com>

Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>I agree. As far as illegal low-power use of HTs on simplex, WE HAVE

>THAT PROBLEM TODAY! It is the availability of HTs to the UNLICENSED
>that causes a problem. I have seen this in my area. I quickly
>"butted in" and asked the stations to identify. Things got quiet
>real fast. The next time I hear them, I'll DF them and catch them.
>
>Assuming your suggestion WAS made legal by a rule change, THE LICENSED
>CONTROL UP WOULD BE IDENTIFYING and (hopefully) observing all regulations.
>
>Again, for very low power simplex, how is this a problem??

Simple Kevin. It is NOT amateur radio. Other services serve that purpose.
Amature serves its purposes. How would this proposal serve the purposes of
amateur radio as expressed in Part 97? Part 15, GMRS, et. al. already DO
this function.

Dan

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #374
